REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,382 to Schneier et al. ("*Schneier*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,412 to Christiano ("*Christiano*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980 to Stefik et al. ("*Stefik*"); rejected claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Schneier*, in view of *Christiano*, in view of *Stefik*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,288 to Castor et al. ("*Castor*"); and rejected claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Christiano* in view of *Stefik*.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, and 57. Claims 1-11, 15-22, and 57 remain pending and under current examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites a data processing apparatus including, for example:

> an arithmetic processing circuit . . .
> a public key encryption module that performs authentication, creates signature data, encrypts and decrypts data for transferring, and shares a session key data obtained by the authentication;
> a common key encryption module that performs mutual authentication and encrypts and decrypts data by using the session key data
> . . .

(emphasis added). *Schneier* discloses "a computer device including a memory device having [an] encoded control code embodied therein and a processor disposed in

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

communication with the memory device" (col. 3, line 67 - col. 4, line 2). *Schneier* is silent regarding the claimed "public key encryption module" and "common key encryption module." Therefore, *Schneier* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a public key encryption module that performs authentication, creates signature data, encrypts and decrypts data for transferring, and shares a session key data obtained by the authentication" and "a common key encryption module that performs mutual authentication and encrypts and decrypts data by using the session key data," as recited in claim 1.

Christiano does not cure the deficiencies of *Schneier*. *Christiano* discloses a license server that "provides package and program licenses and allows several license modifiers to be stored in license records . . ." (col. 3, lines 14-16). "If the user has checked out an overdraft license or a failsafe license, then preferably this information is logged by the license server in a file or database. The license provider can thus later refer to the log to determine how many overdraft and fail safe licenses were granted to clients." *Christiano* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a public key encryption module that performs authentication, creates signature data, encrypts and decrypts data for transferring, and shares a session key data obtained by the authentication" and "a common key encryption module that performs mutual authentication and encrypts and decrypts data by using the session key data," as recited in claim 1.

Stefik does not cure the deficiencies of *Schneier* and *Christiano*. *Stefik* is silent regarding the claimed "public key encryption module" and "common key encryption module." Therefore, *Stefik* also does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of

elements including, for example, "a public key encryption module that performs authentication, creates signature data, encrypts and decrypts data for transferring, and shares a session key data obtained by the authentication" and "a common key encryption module that performs mutual authentication and encrypts and decrypts data by using the session key data," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Schneier*, *Christiano*, and *Stefik* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Claims 2-11 and 15-16 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 17 and 57, though of different scope from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Although the Examiner cites *Castor* in the rejection of dependent claims 18-22, Applicants respectfully assert that *Castor* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Schneier*, *Christiano*, and *Stefik* discussed above. Therefore, claims 18-22 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 17.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 21, 2007

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220